

REMARKS

In the last Office Action, claims 1-3, 7 and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,485,200 to Tanikawa et al. ("Tanikawa"). Claims 4-6 and 18-20 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim and were otherwise indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 8-14 were held withdrawn from further consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention.

The drawings filed with the application were accepted by the Examiner. The Examiner also acknowledged applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §119 but did not indicate receipt of the priority document which was filed with the application. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner acknowledge receipt of the priority document in the next communication.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of their application without amendment of the claims.

The present invention is directed to a sector drive unit for a camera for driving sectors to open and close an aperture formed on a base plate. As shown, for example, in the embodiment of Figs. 1-7, the sector drive unit comprises a first actuator 4 for driving sectors 12 to open and close an

aperture 1a formed on a base plate 1. A drive force transmitting mechanism 7 transmits the driving force of the first actuator 4 to the sectors 12 to thereby open and close the aperture 1a. A sector retaining unit 19 retains the sectors 12 at a position opening the aperture 1a (Fig. 3) and at a position closing the aperture (Fig. 1). A second actuator 21 is provided for driving the sector retaining unit 19 to a position to retain the sectors in positions where they open and close the aperture (Figs. 1 and 3) and to a position to not retain the sectors in positions to open and close the aperture (Figs. 2 and 4).

By provision of the sector retaining unit 19, the sectors 12 are prevented from opening and closing accidentally when the camera is subjected to an impact or the like, and the desired state of the sectors can be retained without undergoing change due to an impact or the like. By provision of the second actuator 21, the sector retaining unit 19 can be driven to a non-retaining position in which the sector retaining unit does not retain the sectors thereby freeing the sectors in readiness for closing and opening the aperture.

No similar sector drive unit is disclosed by Tanikawa. In applying Tanikawa against claims 1-3, 7 and 15-17, applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has misinterpreted the reference disclosure vis-à-vis the claims.

Tanikawa discloses a double-shielding type focal-plane shutter that is fundamentally different from the present invention. In applying Tanikawa to independent claims 1 and 15, the Examiner construed the electromagnet 11 as the claimed first actuator. This is not correct. Claim 1 requires that the first actuator drive the sectors to open and close the aperture, and claim 15 requires that the first actuator produce a driving force that is transmitted by the drive force transmitting mechanism to the sectors to drive them to aperture-opening and aperture-closing positions. The electromagnet 11 of Tanikawa does not drive the sectors (blades) to open and close the aperture as required by the claims. Instead, the electromagnet 11, when energized, attracts a closing lever 6 and retains it in the open position. To close the aperture, the closing lever 6 is turned by the urging force of a tension spring 9 and to open the aperture, the closing lever 6 is turned by a set lever 1 driven by a motor (not shown). Thus the electromagnet 11 does not drive the closing lever to open and close the sectors and, therefore, does not correspond to the claimed first actuator.

Similarly, the closing levers 6 and 7 do not correspond to the claimed drive force transmitting mechanism because the levers do not transmit the drive force of the first actuator. Since the electromagnet 11 does not

correspond to the claimed first actuator, the closing levers 6 and 7 do not correspond to the claimed drive force transmitting mechanism that transmits the driving force of the first actuator to the sectors.

In addition, the lock lever 2 of Tanikawa does not correspond to the claimed sector retaining unit. As claimed, the sector retaining unit retains the sectors at a position opening the aperture and at a position closing the aperture (claim 1), and the sector retaining unit is driveable to a retaining position to retain the sectors in the aperture-opening position and the aperture-closing position and to a non-retaining position in which the sector retaining unit does not retain the sectors (claim 15). In Tanikawa, the lock lever 2 retains the closing lever 7 in the opening position, it does not retain the closing lever 7 in the closing position. Thus the lock lever 2 does not correspond to the claimed sector retaining unit as it does not retain the sectors at positions opening the aperture and closing the aperture.

In the absence of the foregoing limitations recited in independent claims 1 and 15, anticipation cannot be found. See, e.g., W.L. Gore & Associates v. Garlock, Inc., 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984) ("Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art

reference of each element of the claim under consideration"); Continental Can Co. USA v. Monsanto Co., 20 USPQ2d 1746, 1748 (Fed. Cir. 1991) ("When more than one reference is required to establish unpatentability of the claimed invention anticipation under § 102 can not be found"); Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (emphasis added) ("Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim").

Stated otherwise, there must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure, as viewed by a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention. This standard is clearly not satisfied by Tanikawa for the reasons stated above. Furthermore, Tanikawa does not suggest the claimed subject matter and, therefore, would not have motivated one skilled in the art to modify the Tanikawa sector drive unit to arrive at the claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent claims 1 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tanikawa be withdrawn.

With respect to dependent claims 2 and 16, claim 2 requires that the drive force transmitting mechanism includes a drive member connected to a rotary shaft of the first actuator, and claim 16 requires that the drive force transmitting mechanism has a pivotally mounted operating member responsive to a rotational driving force produced by a rotary shaft of the first actuator. These limitations are not found Tanikawa. In the reference, the supporting shaft 5a does not correspond to the claimed rotary shaft of the first actuator, but rather the supporting shaft 5a pivotally supports the closing levers 6 and 7. The supporting shaft 5a does not transmit the drive force of the first actuator as required by these claims.

With respect to dependent claims 3 and 7, these require that the second actuator comprises an electrically energizable actuator which is turned OFF when the sector retaining unit is at the position for retaining the sectors and turned ON when the sector retaining unit at the position where the sectors are not retained. In Tanikawa, the second actuator (the not shown motor) drives the lock lever 2 via the set lever 1. However, the lock lever 2 does not correspond to the claimed sector retaining unit which retains the sectors in both opening and closing positions, and therefore the unshown motor does not correspond to the claimed second actuator.

Similarly, as to claim 17, the unshown motor does not correspond to the claimed electromagnetic actuator since it does not drive the lock lever 2 to a non-retaining position as required by claim 17. Stated otherwise, the lock lever 2 does not correspond to the claimed sector retaining unit which retains the sectors in the aperture-opening position and the aperture-closing position.

In view of the foregoing, it can be appreciated that Tanikawa contains no disclosure of a sector retaining unit for retaining the sectors at aperture-opening and aperture-closing positions in the manner required by the claims. Moreover, there is no disclosure in Tanikawa that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Tanikawa to arrive at the claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing, favorable reconsideration and passage of the application to issue are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ADAMS & WILKS
Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Bruce L. Adams
Reg. No. 25,386

17 Battery Place
Suite 1231
New York, NY 10004
(212) 809-3700

MAILING CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AMENDMENT, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date indicated below.

Debra Buonincontri

Name

Debra Buonincontri

Signature

MARCH 15, 2006

Date